

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NUMBER : 2005-270-G

IN RE: Request for Investigation to)	
Determine Whether a Regulation)	
Should be Promulgated Requiring)	Response to the Petition for
Relocation of Certain Meter Sets or)	Reconsideration and
Installation of Splash Guards on)	Motion for Clarification
These Meter Sets.)	
_____)	

COMES NOW, JAN AYER and shows this her Response to the Petition for Reconsideration and Motion for Clarification and respectfully submits the following:

I. Status Reports

All utility companies whether they have Number 12 meters or not and all utilities who have deemed that their Number 12 Meters have been reconfigured and/or splash-guards installed before the January 19, 2006 hearing, should submit status reports to the Commission, not to ORS. The Public Service Commission should not give ORS authority to determine which gas providers should be required to file status reports with the Commission. Evidence shows that after the ORS Official 60 Day Survey was sent to SCE&G, SCE&G responded that there were no affected meters. Vernon Gainey (Pipeline Safety Supervisor for ORS) and Dukes Scott (Director of ORS) did not prove themselves accountable until after media coverage in June 2005 when the official advisory was sent to all gas operators. According to testimony, after the ORS official survey of SCE&G, the utility company deemed that they had no Number 12 meters affected by water around August 23, 2005. In mid-September of 2005, SCE&G claimed

they had around 3,000 Number 12 meters affected by water. In Martin Phalen's testimony to the Public Service Commission January 19, 2006, Mr. Phalen deemed SCE&G had completed their remediation program with 8,524 meter splash-guard installed or reconfigured, but had incorrectly identified 10,273 meters that were or could be affected by water. In light of this fact, no one should be exempt from filing a status report under any circumstances. Now, SCE&G has reported that all of the Number 12 meters in South Carolina had been reconfigured and/or installed with splash-guards. The South Carolina public can not reasonably be assured that SCE&G's reportings to ORS have been accurate in the past or will be in the future. Please refer to Jan Ayer's testimony and ORS exhibits.

II. \$5000 Property Damage Reporting Requirement and On-Site Investigation

All gas incidents need to be reported. If ORS had only asked Jan Ayer in February 2005 during their conversations about the safety and concern for other citizens for South Carolina, they would have known the property damage amount at 1140 Ridgecrest Avenue, North Augusta, South Carolina was in excess of \$5,000. Therefore, there should not be any threshold amount on gas incidents. People could die for lack of information. This will give all utility companies an opportunity to study and learn. According to on-site investigations, no one from the ORS asked Ms. Ayer any questions about the property damage to her home in February 2005. In fact, Ms. Ayer did not start repairs until March 1, 2005 because she was terrified to move back in her home. SCE&G told Ms. Ayer the day of the explosion January 29, 2005 why the meter froze and that SCE&G wasn't liable. There should be a third-party to investigate all gas incidents. If

the gas companies use their own judgment about property damage estimates, as they did in Ms. Ayer's case when the damage amount was underestimated by \$12,000, then this mistake will happen frequently. ORS had from February 18, 2005 to March 1, 2005 to do an "extensive investigation" at Ms. Ayer's property as they claimed they did in their testimony. Ms. Ayer stated that she asked Vernon Gainey in February of 2005 if he had gone to her home to investigate. Mr. Gainey stated that he had not gone to Ms. Ayer's home, but had met with SCE&G. The goal of the PSC is to seek to insure that the citizens of South Carolina receive appropriate levels of customer satisfaction which would include safety.

Jan Ayer respectfully asks the commission to consider these facts in making accurate decisions for the safety of other citizens of the great state of South Carolina.

s/ Maureen O. Floyd

Maureen O. Floyd

SC State Bar No.: 002053

THIS DOCUMENT IS AN EXACT DUPLICATE, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE FORM OF THE SIGNATURE, OF THE E-FILED COPY SUBMITTED TO THE COMMISSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS ELECTRONIC FILING INSTRUCTIONS.

